

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 12, 25, 26, 28-32, 36, 45, 49, 50, 52-56, and 60 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-8, 12, 25, 26, 28-32, 36, 45, 49, 50, 52-56, and 60 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102) by Raff (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,868). Applicants traverse for the following reasons.

Amended claims 1, 25, and 49 concern accessing calendar information of users in a database for presentation by a personal information manager, and require: maintaining scheduled event records for users within the database, including a given user; maintaining information for the given user on shadowed events for a tracked entity that are part of the tracked entity's scheduled event records, wherein the tracked entity was selected by the given user; providing from the database scheduled event records for the given user and information on shadowed events of at least one tracked entity, wherein the scheduled event records of the given user are capable of being scheduled at calendar times that overlap with scheduled shadowed events for the at least one tracked entity; displaying information on the provided scheduled event records and shadowed events for a time period in response to displaying the given user's scheduled event records; receiving selection from the given user to add a selected shadowed event to the given user's scheduled event records; and adding the selected shadowed event to the given user's scheduled event records in the database, wherein shadowed event records from the tracked entity added to the given user's scheduled event records are displayed as part of the given user's scheduled event records.

Applicants amended claim 1 to clarify that the shadowed events are part of the tracked entity's scheduled event records and that the tracked entity was selected by the given user, to clarify that the user is a "given user" of the users in the database, that information on shadowed events are displayed in response to displaying the given user's scheduled event records, that the tracked entity's scheduled event record comprising the selected shadowed event is added, and that the scheduled event records from the tracked entity added to the given user's scheduled event records are displayed as part of the given user's scheduled event records.. The additional requirements of these claims are disclosed on pg. 17, line 10 to pg. 22 of the Application.

The Examiner cited FIG. 16, element 615 and col. 14, line 27 of Raff with respect to the pre-amended limitation which now recites receiving selection from the given user to add a

selected shadowed event to the given user's scheduled event records, where shadowed events are part of the tracked entity's scheduled event records.

The cited FIG. 16 shows a pulldown window 600 displayed in the calendar application showing calendar information from the "default category" or the calendar user appointments. The user can select from the pulldown window 600 other categories, such as "wife" and "child2" to display their schedules as shown in FIG. 15. (Raff, col. 13, lines 28-45).

The cited Raff concerns a technique to select another user, referred to as the "non-default category", so as to display the calendar events of that other user with the "default" calendar events. However, nowhere does the cited Raff teach or suggest selecting a tracked entity's scheduled event record displayed as a shadowed event to add to the given user's scheduled event records in the database.

First off, Raff does not disclose selecting a shadowed event. Instead, through the pulldown window 600, the user selects a category of items to display in the calendar, not a shadowed event. Further, the cited Raff just shows displaying the scheduled events for a selected non-default category, such as "wife", "child2", in the calendar, not adding any scheduled events for these other non-default categories to the default category. Thus, although the cited Raff allows one to display the events of another user, i.e., non-default category, with the default user, Raff does not teach or suggest adding the other non-default user's, e.g., the wife or child2, scheduled events to the default scheduled events.

The Examiner further cited col. 14, line 27, finding that this section discloses adding a tracked entity's scheduled event record comprising the shadowed event to the given user's scheduled event records. (Final Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 14 mentions that users may synchronize their portable computer system with their default calendar information with the database. Thus, a category which is non-default for one user having portable computer 100a, is the default category for computer 100b. Col. 14 mentions that the computer 100b synchronizes the information (for Wife) on computer 100b with the database.

Nowhere does the cited col. 14 anywhere disclose adding a shadowed event for a tracked entity to the given user's records. For instance, nowhere does the cited col. 14 disclose adding the wife's (non-default) calendar records to the calendar database of the default user displaying the wife as a "non-default" category. Thus, in the cited col. 14 a portable computer for a default

user synchronizes with the database for the default user. However, nowhere does the cited col. 14 disclose that a non-default, i.e., shadowed, user's records are added to the database for the default user displaying the non-default events in a non-default manner, i.e., shadowed.. In other words, with the cited Raff, synchronization only occurs between a default user's computer and the default user's database, and not the default user's (default) records and a shadowed (non-default) user's records.

Moreover, Raff teaches away from adding a selected shadowed event to the given user's scheduled events. Raff states that "[i]t is appreciated that while any of the calendar information can be updated ... by computer 100a, changes made by the computer 100a to categories that are not the default will not be synchronized back to the database." (Raff, col. 13, line 64 to col. 14, line 3) Thus, the changes to scheduled events or calendar information for non-default category users, e.g., wife, child2, etc., are not added to the default category in the database. Raff further states that "the category designation 445 of the shared calendar information 456 is not allowed to be altered." (Raff, col. 11, lines 45-50).

Thus, not only does the cited Raff not teach or suggest selecting a shadowed event record to add to the scheduled event records of the given user in the database, Raff teaches away from adding a shadowed user's scheduled events (i.e., the non-default category calendar events) to the given user's database, i.e., the default user.

Accordingly, amended claims 1, 25, and 49 are patentable over the cited art because the cited of Raff does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2, 4-8, 12, 26, 28-32, 36, 45, 50, 52-56, and 60 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 25, and 49.

2. Claims 3, 27, and 51 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 27, and 51 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff in view of Coleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,732). (Final Office Action, pgs. 5-6)

Applicants traverse because these claims depend from claims 1, 25, and 49, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

3. Claims 9, 10, 11, 33, 34, 35, 57, 58, and 59 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 11, 33, 34, 35, 57, 58, and 59 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff in view of Barnett (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,840) . Applicants traverse.

Applicants traverse because these claims depend from claims 1, 25, and 49, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, these claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

The Examiner cited col. 14, line 13 of Barnett as teaching the additional requirements of claims 9, 33, and 57 that the scheduled shadowed event is an event for which payment must be received in order to attend the scheduled shadowed event. (Final Office Action, pg. 6)

Although the cited col. 14 mentions a link for making a purchase associated with an event in a calendar, nowhere does the cited col. 14 disclose that a shadowed event is an event for which payment must be received in order to attend the shadowed event. There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in the cited art that a scheduled event is an event for which payment must be received. In fact, the cited Raff teaches away from such modification, because the only event it shows being displayed with the default user are calendar events from other people, not events that one would attend as claimed. There is no suggestion to modify the events of Raff with events to attend for which payment must be received.

Accordingly, claims 9, 33, and 57 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

4. Claims 21, 24, 45, 48, 69, and 72 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner found that claims 21, 24, 25, 48, 69, and 72 are obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff in view of Moon (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,975). Applicants traverse.

Amended claims 21, 45, and 69 recite implementing a personal information manager in an electronic calendar device for a user, and require: displaying scheduled records for a designated time period of the user in the electronic calendar; providing scheduled event records for the user and information on shadowed events of at least one tracked person, wherein the scheduled event records are capable of being scheduled at calendar times that overlap with scheduled shadowed events for the at least one tracked; displaying information on the provided scheduled event records and shadowed events for a time period; and displaying location

information providing a current location of the tracked person provided by an electronic device with the tracked person transmitting location information.

Applicants amended claims 21, 45, and 69 to recite that the tracked entity is a tracked person and to require that the shadowed events are part of the tracked person's scheduled event records, wherein the tracked entity was selected by the given user.

The Examiner cited col. 5, line 29 of Moon as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pgs. 7-8) The cited col. 5 mentions that one can activate a button to indicate the location of a party with whom ones portable electronic device is having or had communication with. Although the cited Moon mentions displaying location information of another person or device, nowhere does the cited Moon or other art anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement of displaying location information on a tracked person whose shadowed events are displayed with the scheduled events of the user. This particular combination of displaying the location of tracked users whose shadowed events are displayed with scheduled events is nowhere taught or suggested in the cited art.

According to the Manual of Patent Examination and Procedure ("MPEP") the "mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." MPEP Sec. 2143.01, p. 2100-131 (Rev. 2, May 2004). Here, the Examiner is suggesting a modification nowhere taught or suggested in the cited art – displaying location information on a tracked person whose shadowed events are displayed with the scheduled events of the user. For this reason, the proposed modification is not proper.

Accordingly, claims 21, 45, and 69 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest the claim requirements.

Claims 24, 58, and 72 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 21, 45, and 69, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

5. Claims 73, 75, and 77 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner found that claims 73, 75, and 77 are obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff in view of Tognazzini (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,974). Applicants traverse.

Claims 73, 75, and 77 depend from claims 1, 25, and 49 and further require generating a conflict signal if scheduled event records for one user are scheduled for overlapping calendar times, and wherein the conflict signal is not generated if at least one shadowed event record and scheduled event record for which the information is displayed are scheduled for overlapping calendar times.

Claims 73, 75, and 77 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 25, and 49, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-5, 7-12, 21, 24-29, 31-36, 45, 48-53, 55-60, 69, and 72-78 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants request that no additional fees, other than the RCE fee, are required for the claim amendments. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: October 13, 2005

By: 

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984